

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicants acknowledge, with thanks, receipt of the office action dated September 26, 2007, and completion of the personal interview of November 6, 2007. The Examiner's suggestions and observations are much appreciated and incorporated herein. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, 21-24 are currently pending.

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "computer-readable medium" as found in claims 25-32. Claims 25-32 have been cancelled, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter as they are directed to software. The applicants respectfully traverse. Claims 9-16 are directed to a system for distributing a document to at least one destination. The system includes means adapted for receiving document data representative of an electronic document. The system includes a client computer 104 which is used by a user to create a document. The system also includes a document management platform 102, which includes a document management module 114 and a document distribution module or queue 112. The document management platform includes a hardware component, such as a server, and a software component. The document management platform provides functionality for storing documents, and to facilitate user capability to modify documents, collaborate during document editing, and search and locate stored documents. The user creates a document at the client computer and it is then received at the document management module. The document management platform then creates a job by job creating means and appends printer job language commands to the document as required in claim 9. Claim 9 further requires means for communicating the document with appended job language to a document distribution queue via a network. The document distribution queue receives the document and parses the appended printer job language command as required by claim 9. The document distribution queue then distributes the job to at least one destination based on the parsed printer job language command as required in claim 9. Claims 10-16 add further limitations to the components set forth in claim 9. As such, the system set forth in claims 9-16 are not merely software, and therefore, this rejection should be overcome.

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,897,260 to Zingher. In view of the amendments and arguments set forth, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the art of record.

By way of review, the subject application is directed to a system and method for distribution a document to at least one destination. Document data representative of an electronic document is received for distribution. Printer Job Language (PJP) was developed by Hewlett-Packard to provide a method for switching printer languages at the job level, and to transmit status information between the printer and a host computer. PJP adds job level controls, such as printer language switching, job separation, environment, status and device attendance. The subject application includes novel use of PJP relative to document distribution, and operates on PJP commands for queue operation, rather than printer management or control. A job is created by appending to the document data at least one printer job language command, wherein the printer job language command includes instructions for the distribution of the job by a document distribution queue. The electronic document with the appended printer job language command is communicated to the document processing queue, wherein the appended printer job language is parsed. The job is then distributed to at least one destination based on the parsed printer job language command.


In contrast, Zingher is directed to a system wherein a job is sent to a queue for processing. No distribution information is appended to the job. The queue in Zingher is aware of various printing plant options available to it, along with workloads or features available at such printing plants. The queue then intelligently decides where to send the printing job for optimized processing.

In view of the afore-noted comments, amendment has been made to each of independent claims 1, 9 and 17 to render more clearly the patentable distinctions over the art of record. By virtue of such amendment, all claims now include limitations wherein routing information is provided within the printer job language, and a queue to which the document is sent parses out this information and routes the document accordingly. It is submitted that, as clarified, all claims are patentably distinct over the art of record and in condition for allowance thereover. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/33336.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 9, 2007



---

Susan L. Mizer  
Registration No. 38,245  
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP  
1150 Huntington Bldg.  
925 Euclid Ave.  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414  
**Customer No.: 23380**  
Tel.: (216) 696-3466  
Fax: (216) 592-5009